THE

# MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. I.] BOSTON, DECEMBER, 1860. [No. 12.

## INTRODUCTION TO JOHN.

### A NEW EXPLANATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF LOGOS, OR WORD.

PART II.

IN giving an explanation, in the last number of the "Monthly," of John, chap. 1, ver. 1–18, we said, —

1. The WORD means speech.

2. The Divine Word means the Divine Speech, or Revelation.

3. There are three of these Divine Words, or Revelations; namely, —

1. The Word in nature and history.
2. The Word in the soul of man.
3. The Word in Jesus Christ.

The Word in nature utters power, wisdom, law, goodness: the Word in the soul utters personality, unity, creation, freedom, holiness.

We now come to the third Word of God; namely, the Man Christ Jesus. The first Word was God in nature; the second word was God in the soul; the third Word is God manifested in a human life.

Two questions arise here. First, The historical question: *Was* Christ, in this sense, a Word of God? Second, The theological question: *How* was he the Word of God? To which we may afterward add a third, or practical religious question: *Why* was he the Word of God?

The question of fact or history is, Was Jesus a Divine Word in any other sense than all great men and good men are divine words? Is there any essential difference between Christ, on the one hand, and Abraham, Moses, and Elias, on the other? or between him and Socrates, Plato, Confucius, Solon? between his inspiration and that of Homer, Dante, Columbus? This is a question of fact, not a question of theology; a question to be decided, not by speculation, but by looking at the thing itself.

Now, we plainly see that there is a divine inspiration in all greatness and goodness. We have said as much in saying that God speaks in the human soul his second Word. But the question now is, Does God speak *another* Word again, and make a yet higher manifestation, in Christ? Is the Word in Christ an advance on the Word spoken in nature, making it another communication? Is it the beginning of a new order of truth, or only the culmination of the old order?

To answer this question, we must see, by going back, what we have found revealed to us in nature and in the soul, and so learn if there is any thing in our idea of God unaccounted for; and, if so, whether that has come to us specially through Christ.

Through nature we saw manifested (1) Power, (2) Law, (3) Wisdom, (4) Goodness; through the soul we saw manifested (1) Unity and Personality, (2) Creation or Freedom, (3) Holiness. Now, if Jesus merely shows us these same qualities carried to their highest point, he is not another Word of God, but only a higher power of the

same Word; but, if he adds some new element, then he is a new manifestation.

The apostle says that the law was given by Moses, but that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. What is grace, and what is truth?

The grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ convey the idea of an influx of divine love and truth into the soul. It is a gift of God to the soul, — an additional power sufficient to enable it to conquer evil. It is not enough to see goodness as a law: we need to feel it as a power. Through Christ comes to us the conviction of an eternal life, which shall abide within us, making all things new; of a new birth of the soul, lifting it to a higher plane of being. Christ alone gives the idea of such a perfect union with God as shall constitute moral affection. He is one who has himself wholly escaped from sin; who is morally perfect; and who ascribes this perfection, not to himself, but to the life of God flowing perpetually into him. Jesus says, "By the grace of God I have been made free from sin, to show you also that you shall be free from sin, and perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." This is a very different idea of God from that which we perceive in other revelations. Nature teaches us the goodness of God: Christ teaches us the love of God. They are very different things. In nature, God shows himself desiring to make us happy; in Christ, as seeking to unite us with himself. But God is holy; and, while we are sinful, we cannot come into communion with him. We are all conscious of sinfulness, and we cannot by our own efforts escape from it: therefore we need divine aid in order to be purified; and God, in Christ, offers us such aid. Neither nature nor the soul says any thing of forgiveness; and the forgiveness taught in the Old Testament is removing the penalty of sin, but not removing sin itself. But for-

giveness in the New Testament is reconciliation, atonement, union; something which does away, not merely with the penalty of sin and the guilt of sin, but also with sin itself.

We therefore find the love of God revealed in Christ to the soul to be a new revelation of the divine character, and one not found in nature nor in the human mind. It is not the general love or good-will of the Creator for his creatures, but the individual personal affection of the Father for his child. It is not the desire to do good, but the need of loving and being loved. It is not merely giving, but giving and receiving; that is, communion. God's life flows forth from him in creation: he gives away part of himself in making a world outside of himself. More of his life flows out from himself when he creates souls, — individuals with a power of resisting him, and separating themselves from him. His first Word went out into an empty universe, and never returned, — there was no echo to it; the second went out in the creation of souls made free, so that they even could resist their Maker, disobey him, and turn away from him; but the third Word goes out with a still greater influx of divine life, to unite all these free individuals again with God in one grand union, so that God shall be once more all in all.

There was once a great king, who determined to erect a city. He sent architects and workmen and materials; he laid out streets and squares; dug reservoirs, and brought in water in aqueducts; made roads and canals leading from it to the surrounding country; and, when all was ready, sent a colony to inhabit it. These inhabitants went to and fro through the streets, examined the city, and said to one another, "What a powerful government it must be that was able to build this city!" And, as they looked further and examined it more, they said, "What wisdom, what

foresight, did this power display in this city! How wisely was the site chosen! What order and method in all the arrangements! What knowledge in the choice of materials, in building, and in the general plan!" And then, looking still further, they say, "What goodness *to us!* How are our wants foreseen, and all provided for! We have high walls to defend us from without; markets, aqueducts, bazaars, gas, paved and lighted streets, within. Every thing is arranged for our comfort. The government which built this city — whether it be a monarchy, an oligarchy, or a democracy — has evidently *power*, *wisdom*, and *goodness*."

The inhabitants of the city have thus heard in the city itself One Word about the maker of the city. The city itself speaks of its founder's power, wisdom, and goodness; but you observe that they are not yet able to tell whether the founder of the city is one or many, nor what his ideas are about right or wrong.

But now let us suppose that the founder of the city sends a viceroy to live in it, who establishes himself in a central palace; announcing the name of the king for whom he governs; publishing the code of laws, with penalties attached; rewarding the obedient, and punishing the disobedient. He does all this in the name of his absent master. *Now* the people know more about the master: they know that he is one; they also know what his ideas are concerning right and wrong. They have thus heard a Second Word from him, which brings him nearer to them than the first did.

But let us suppose that these citizens become disorderly. They disobey the laws established for their government. They rebel against the viceroy and his authority. They plunge into vices, and commit crimes. They grow idle, intemperate, reckless. So come pauperism, disease, and

crime. A famine arises, and many starve to death. A pestilence follows, and they die in the streets. Bands of robbers prowl the streets day and night for plunder and murder. In this state of things, the king who built the city comes to live in it. He becomes personally acquainted with the citizens. He shows them the misery of their course; explains to them the importance of his laws, and the need of obeying them. He establishes hospitals for the sick. He feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, visits the prisoners. The people all become personally acquainted with him, and learn to love him because he had loved them.

And now it is evident that they have had a new Word spoken to them concerning their king. The Word is made flesh, and dwells among them; and they have come into personal communion with him.

This story illustrates the three steps of progress in our knowledge of God. That which the citizens learned about their king from the city itself corresponds with what we learn about God from nature, — the city which he has built for us; that which they learned by the government of the viceroy corresponds with what we learn of God by means of his viceroy, — conscience in the soul itself; and what they learned of their king when he came to live among them corresponds with what we learn of God in Christ "reconciling the world unto himself," and "formed within us, the hope of glory."

It is in this sense that we may regard Jesus as a new divine Word; different from the Word in nature, also different from the Word in the soul. And this is the divinity of Christ, — that as God's power, wisdom, and goodness dwell constantly in nature, that as God's holiness and freedom constantly manifest themselves anew in the soul's freedom and conscience, that so God's love to individuals is constantly manifested in the life of Jesus.

This third manifestation of God was necessary to harmonize the other two. The soul, as freedom, is not in harmony with nature, as law. Love is necessary to reconcile law and freedom. This is the true atonement.

The question of fact being ascertained, we may next consider the question of theology. We have seen, that, as a matter of fact, God is in the life of Christ in the same way that he is in outward nature and inward nature. But *how* was God in Christ? To answer this question belongs to theology. Let us look at some of the theological answers.

First we have the Orthodox answer. This is the answer given in most of the creeds, and to vary from which exposes one to the charge of heresy in all the great Christian communions. This answer is, that "Christ is the eternal Son of God, of one substance, and equal, with the Father; who became man, and continues to be God and man in two natures and one person for ever: so that two whole perfect and distinct natures are inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion; which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, — the only Mediator between God and man."

It is well known that Unitarians object to this view on grounds of reason and Scripture. On grounds of reason they assert that there could have been in Christ but one person. But they deny that there could have been two natures in one person: for the union of two natures — one infinite, and the other finite — in one person would imply that this person would, at the same time and in the same sense, possess infinite power, and not possess it; possess infinite wisdom, and not possess it; possess infinite goodness, and not possess it; which would be a contradiction in terms. But it is impossible for the human mind

to accept such a contradiction: hence we must say (in order to maintain the Orthodox doctrine), either that Christ is God and man at a different time, or in a different sense. The first would imply that Christ could pass from his divine nature to his human nature, and back again, so as to lose all consciousness, first of the one, and then of the other. But this contradicts the terms of the statement: hence we must say that Christ must have an infinite nature as God, and a finite nature as man, in a different sense of nature. But this is equivalent to saying that the union is a mystery; which again is equivalent to saying that we do not know what the union was; which finally is to admit that there is *no* Orthodox doctrine on the subject.

This is the real objection to the Orthodox doctrine concerning the divinity of Christ. We do not know what it is. We cannot tell what it means. When probed to the bottom, it resolves itself into a mystery or an obscurity: the statement is no statement. Now, it is very wise and right, when we are ignorant of any thing, to say, "I do not know;" but then we ought not to say that we do not know, and to say at the same time that we *do* know, and that those who do not think about it as we think about it are heretics. Our objection to Orthodoxy is, that it calls upon us to believe a certain theological proposition, under the penalty of excommunication here, and damnation hereafter; and that, when we ask what the proposition means, it replies that it does not know what it means.

The next theological answer is that of Emanuel Swedenborg, who says that Christ was God because his human nature was his human body, animated by God as its soul. According to this view, there is no such thing in Christ as a human soul: consequently, he was in no real sense a human being. He merely had a human body; but a human body without a human soul is not a human being.

But, if Christ was not truly a man, then the four Gospels are a mere illusion; for they everywhere represent him as having a human soul as well as a human body. With his human soul he was tempted; with his human soul he prayed; with his human soul he suffered; with his human soul he died. Mainly for this reason, we reject the doctrine of Swedenborg concerning the Lord. It destroys the human nature of Christ.

The third explanation declares that Christ was divine, and was a Word of God, because he was a human medium through whom God revealed his divine love. His human will was in perfect harmony with the will of God, and so his life became a revelation of his Father's will. So when Jesus says, "I and my Father are one," he does not intend *one person* (as the Orthodox say), nor one nature (as the Swedenborgians imply), but one by becoming united in perfect sympathy of thought, heart, and will.

So much for theology, or the problem of the "WORD."

## SUMMARY.

We sum up what we have thus far said, as follows: —

1. NATURE OF THE INTRODUCTION TO JOHN. — The Apostle John has introduced his Gospel with a profound and deeply interesting preamble, which is at once so compact with thought, and so brimming with life, as to occupy and task the best thinkers in their best hours. The interpretation of this famous passage has suffered much from sectarian efforts to force it into the service of narrow dogmas. Trinitarians on the one side, and Unitarians on the other, have tried to make it appear that the great apostle was merely arguing in the interest of their special controversy. But his theme is not partial, but universal. This brief passage contains the history of all revelations. It gives us the genesis, progress, and completion of the divine manifesta-

tions. This is sufficiently evident from the terms used, which are the largest, and used in the widest sense, — "the Word," "Life," "Light," "Darkness," "Grace," "Truth."

If we read this noble passage with no sectarian bias or prepossession, but a simple desire to know its meaning, its difficulties will soon begin to vanish, and its real sense will become very apparent. We must not seek to put our own ideas into the passage, but to extract out of it those of the apostle.

2. THE WORD. — What does John mean by "the Word"?

To answer this question, we must consider the following points: —

(*a.*) John must, of course, have expected to be understood by his readers. His first readers were the Christian inhabitants of Asia Minor, where he wrote his Gospel. The term "Word," as used by him, could not have been a new term never used by them, but one with which they were familiar; otherwise they could not have understood what he was speaking of.

(*b.*) The term "Word," thus used, is peculiar to John. No one among the writers of the New Testament but he uses the phrase in this absolute sense. The others frequently speak of "the Word of God," but not of "the Word" by itself; and, except in this passage, John nowhere uses this expression without some qualifying adjunct.

(*c.*) But, in the Old Testament and the New, we find the term "Word" used in a sense almost equivalent to this. We find God's Word spoken of as a person, running to and fro, leaping down from the heavens, coming to the prophets, creating the heavens and their host, &c.

("The Word of God came to Nathan," &c., 1 Chron.

xvii. 3. "The Word of God came to John in the wilderness," &c., Luke iii. 2. "His Word runneth very swiftly," Ps. cxlvii. 15. "The worlds were framed by the Word of God," Heb. xi. 3. "By the Word of God the heavens were of old," 2. Pet. iii. 5. "Thine Almighty Word leapt down from heaven, from his royal throne," &c., Wisd. of Sol. xviii. 15.)

(*d.*) Not only the "Word of God" is thus personified in the Bible, but so also is the eye, the ear, the hand, and the arm of God. But we have no difficulty in understanding what is meant in these cases; nor do we ever suppose that personification implies personality. When we read that "the *eyes* of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good," we understand by it the divine knowledge; when we read that "his *ears* are open to our cry," we understand by it the divine readiness to hear prayer; when we read, "Thy right *hand*, O Lord! hath dashed in pieces the enemy," we understand by it the divine activity; when we read that "God's *arm* shall rule for him," that "his *arm* brought salvation," &c., we understand by it the divine energy and power; and when we read, in like manner, of "the *Word* of God," we understand at once the divine utterance, revelation, or manifestations.

(*e.*) If, therefore, John had simply said, "In the beginning was the Word of God, and the Word of God was with God, and the Word was God himself," the Jews would readily have understood him: they would have understood him to mean that God spoke, or revealed himself, in some way, in the beginning; that he manifested his power at that time. But John does not say this: he says "the Word" in a universal form. He must, therefore, have intended by it revelation in a more universal sense; not any particular revelation, but the principle of all

revelations. He meant to speak of the divine principle, or that energy of the divine nature which causes all manifestation on the part of Deity.

(*f.*) Now, we find that among the Jews, in the time of the apostle, were a class of persons, who, by their study of Plato, had been led to take up this very problem of the principle of revelation, or manifestation in the Deity. "Why is it, and how is it, that God reveals himself?" was a question with which Plato and the Platonists, Philo and his followers, and afterwards the Gnostics, were much exercised; and in their theories they were inclined to separate God's manifestation from God himself, and to make the revealing energy in the Deity a kind of subordinate and separate being. John evidently refers to their opinions, and means to oppose this error, in the first and second verses of the passage.

Let us now give a paraphrase of this passage, and see how plain and beautiful is its meaning when we apply to it this explanation of the term "Word." We do not agree, it will be seen, with those Trinitarians who contend that by "Word" is meant a second person in the Deity; nor, on the other hand, do we agree with those Unitarians who maintain that by "Word" is meant the reason or wisdom or power of God. Such a use of the term would have been unintelligible to Jewish Christians. By "Word" is meant, not God's wisdom, but the *revelation* or utterance of his wisdom; not God's power, but the *manifestation* or expression of his power.

3. *The Interpretation.* — Ver. 1. In the beginning of creation, at the commencement of time, was the Divine Revelation. This Divine Revelation was not a separate being from God; it was not an Eon; but was with God, and was God himself; for he was the Revelation.

Ver. 2. The Divine Revelation is, therefore, no new

thing, nor any thing intermediate between God and us; but was with God at first, and is with him now.

Ver. 3. For revelation is the expression of God, and when God acts he expresses himself; and, therefore, by the expression of his will all things were made, and every thing made expressed and revealed him.

Ver. 4. But not merely the inanimate creation, the physical universe, is an expression of God: all LIFE is also a manifestation of him, for in him we live and move, and through him we are. The living soul of man is a light of God within him, revealing God inwardly in his reason and conscience.

Ver. 5. But this inner light is obscured by our ignorance and sin, and so another revelation is necessary.

Ver. 6 and 7. The first revelation of God being in nature, and the second in the soul, the coming of the third was heralded by a new prophet, — John the Baptist.

Ver. 8. John was not sent to be a revelation, but to bear witness to the revelation whenever it should appear.

Ver. 9. Though, even then, the light of God was shining in every man's soul, enlightening him inwardly, if he would only see it and obey it.

Ver. 10. God was manifesting himself to the Gentile world. His will made them, and in their creation he revealed himself; yet they did not know him.

Ver. 11. He came by his prophets to that which was peculiarly his; and his own people (the Jews) never fully recognized him, nor obeyed his revelations.

Ver. 12. But some (both Jews and Gentiles) did receive these prior revelations; and thus, by their faith in God, became his true children.

Ver. 13. Not on account of descent from Abraham, but because they were born of God.

Ver. 14. And, at last, God's Revelation took a human

form, — God speaking to man by man. And now Revelation dwelt among us (not coming and going, as in the transient inspirations of the prophets) in the beauty of a perfect soul; and we have seen his glory, as of the Only-begotten, — God's fulness revealed in the life and words of Jesus.

Ver. 15. And John, who was sent to bear witness to the Light, *did* bear witness to it when he saw it in Jesus Christ (though he knew not that Jesus was the Christ until his baptism, ver. 31–33).

And John said, "This is he of whom I said, A man comes after me (in time) who is preferred before me (in rank); for he always was before me (in true worth and desert)."

Ver. 18. Therefore, though no man hath ever seen God, Jesus, the Christ, has REVEALED him.

4. *Object of John in this Preamble.* — Three different objects are ascribed to John in this passage. Some suppose he had a dogmatical, others a polemical, others a religious purpose. Let us consider this point.

(*a.*) Had John a dogmatical purpose?

It is supposed that his object was to teach that Christ was God. But he declares it to be the purpose of his whole Gospel (chap. xx. 31) to lead men to believe "that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God," and, believing, to have life through his name. It would seem an impotent conclusion, after having taught them in a dozen verses that Jesus was the Supreme God, to employ twenty chapters afterward to convince them that he was the Messiah. Besides, if his purpose was to teach that Jesus was the Supreme Being, why did he not say so directly? Why not say, "In the beginning was Christ, and Christ was with God, and Christ was God?" There could not then have been any mistake as to his meaning. John has certainly

not taught *directly* that Christ was God: has he taught it *indirectly?* Is it a necessary inference from this passage? By no means. The only necessary inference is this, — that the Word, which was God himself speaking, *dwelt* in Christ, and abode in him, filling him with the fulness of God. But to be filled with God is one thing: to be God himself is another and a very different thing. God dwells in all living Christians, and they also are filled with his fulness; but it does not follow that they are God himself.

So far as the purpose of John was doctrinal, it was to teach that Christ has become the final expression of the Divine Will, and is filled with the Divine Fulness; and that, through this medium, we also may have access to God.

(*b.*) Had John a polemical purpose?

Besides the universal purposes which John had in view in this passage, he may, no doubt, have alluded to local and temporary opinions. Thus (ver. 1, 2) he seems to deny the doctrine of his day, that an emanation of God created the worlds, or that the Logos was any thing other than God himself. Again (ver. 14): he refers to the Docetic opinions of his day, that Jesus was human only in appearance (see 1 John iv. 1, 2, 3). Again: he refers (ver. 8, 15, and elsewhere) to those who would elevate John the Baptist to an equality with Jesus.

(*c.*) Had John a religious purpose in this passage?

The chief purpose of John was to teach that the revelation made by Christ was no new thing, nor essentially different from God's other revelations, but that it was fuller and more complete, and brought us into a filial communion with God. He teaches that God has always revealed himself to man: first, in nature and creation; second, in the soul, with its living faculties of insight and aspiration;

and, thirdly, in Christ, as the fulfilment of all positive revelation, or God manifest in the flesh.

This was the great purpose of John, — to bring into one focus, in Christ, all the revelations of God, and to show how his was the universal religion. There could be no profounder, no broader aim than this; and it invests the passage with a grandeur which places it at the head of all Scriptures.

---

## WHY ALL UNITARIAN CHURCHES SHOULD BE MISSIONARY CHURCHES.

Every Christian church has a twofold object. Its object is to receive, and also to impart; to get good, and to do good; to receive truth, and to preach it. A church is in a healthy state in proportion as it does both. It needs this double movement, this *systole and diastole*, for its own life. So the human heart expands and contracts by an alternate motion; opening itself to draw in the blood, closing itself to expel it. So the lungs have a similar double action; first inhaling, and then exhaling, the air. So the earth basks, receptive of the solar rays, and yet continually radiates them again from its surface.

The life of a church, like the life of a single soul, consists in the alternate reception and communication of truth and love.

Unless we impart, we shall cease to receive; or, at any rate, shall be unable to retain. If one only reads or only hears the truth, without repeating it, talking about it, speaking of it, without making use of it, the truth thus passively listened to ceases at last to make any distinct

impression. The pound thus buried in the earth, and not put to use, is taken away. The intellect must re-act upon the truth in order to retain it; and the true re-action is, putting it to use.

The church at first was taught this law, and obeyed it. The disciples of Jesus were by no means passive recipients of his truth: their duty, from the first, was to proclaim it. When all that they knew about the kingdom of Christ was that it was coming, Jesus sent them out to announce that. Almost at the beginning of his ministry, Jesus sent them forth, commanding them, "As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of Heaven is at hand." And at the close of his ministry, when he breathed on them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," he immediately told them why they received it; namely, that they might impart it again; saying, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained:" meaning, I suppose, that God's Spirit would give them spiritual discernment, and that they should use that spiritual discernment to show them where God's forgiving love might be communicated, and where it might not.

Thus the church, from the beginning, was a missionary church, imparting the truth as fast as it received it; and, if it does not continue a missionary church, it loses its first love, and so its life. "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves," applies to us and to our churches now. Our churches languish because there is a surplus of hearing, over teaching and doing. If the lungs should inhale twice as much air in volume as they exhale, if the heart should receive through the veins twice as much blood as it sends out through the arteries, the body would soon become diseased. But what of a church which hears two sermons a week, but sends out none of the truth again? That will grow weak and feeble too.

At the present time, many of our churches do nothing for missions, nothing to diffuse Christian truth, nothing to spread the gospel. They build a meeting-house, divide it into pews, distribute them among themselves, put their families into them, and then go there to worship, and to listen to sermons, for the rest of their lives. They send out no living missionary; they distribute no books; still less do they go out themselves to teach; they scarcely will open their pew-door to invite strangers in: and the consequence is, that they at last lose their interest in what they hear, because they do not impart it again; and they would hardly be able to tell you at the end of the week what they heard at the beginning.

Every church ought, therefore, to be a missionary church, preaching the gospel to every creature. Not all in the same way; for gifts are different with churches as with individuals. Not all to the Heathen in foreign lands; for there are Heathen close beside us. There are Pagans, Hindoos, and followers of Confucius, all around us. Perhaps it is the mission of some churches to preach the gospel to the Christian churches, who have forgotten it; or to the outcasts at the Five Points, who never heard of it.

Thus far, there have been two difficulties in regard to missions, and of an opposite kind. Roman-Catholic missions have failed in one way, and Protestant missions in another. The difficulty with Roman-Catholic missions has been, that they have aimed only at making proselytes, not at making converts. Believing that baptism would save the Heathen, their object was simply to baptize as many of the Heathen as they were able. The consequence was, that they had often a great, a wide, and a sudden success, but not a lasting success. Their converts were not converted, — only proselyted; and so had not much depth of earth. At different times, Eastern Asia and North

Africa were half converted by the Roman Catholics: now Eastern Asia is Buddhist, and North Africa is Mohammedan.

The Protestant missionaries pursued an opposite course, but with just as little success. They were not satisfied with making proselytes by baptism; they were not satisfied even with making converts to Christ: they have wished also to make Calvinists and Presbyterians, Methodists and Episcopalians. But the Oriental mind, incapable of these distinctions, remains unconverted. While Roman-Catholic missionaries, satisfied with baptizing the Heathen, have caught many of them, but lost them again, the Protestant missionaries, with even less success, have scarcely even caught them at all. The attempt to turn a Hindoo into an English Episcopalian, and to change a Chinaman into a Scotch Calvinist, has been eminently unsuccessful.

Unitarians, seeing these failures, have stood still, looked on, waited, criticized, and done nothing. They have been satisfied in vindicating their own right to freedom of opinion. They do not care much to spread their ideas. They think that they spread fast enough. They perceive, that, here in New England, Orthodoxy has become very much mitigated. The old terms remain; but their hardness is gone. Like the ice on the surface of rivers in spring, which has grown spongy and water-soaked, we expect that it will some morning sink and disappear of itself. We want no better Unitarianism than that which is preached in a hundred Orthodox pulpits in New England. Andover stands at present just about where Cambridge stood twenty-five years ago.

Nevertheless, all this does not excuse us for not being a missionary church; nor will it save us from the penalty. If we do not choose to use our talent, it will be taken away. The candle must not be put under a bushel, but

into a candlestick. We must give, for our own sake, as well as receive; we must impart, in order to enjoy; we must teach, in order to learn; we must act, in order to grow.

But, beside this, there are some special reasons for Unitarian missions; the most important of which is, that we have a mission to the sceptics.

Beside the total eclipse of faith which we call "unbelief," there is a partial eclipse which we call "scepticism." The mind is not in the dark shadow, where the earth wholly hides the sun, but in the penumbra, where it partly hides it; and, as the line of a total eclipse is very narrow compared with that of the partial eclipse, so there are always at least a hundred sceptics sitting in the penumbra for one infidel in the shadow.

There are hundreds of thousands of sceptics in Christian countries, made so by various reasons, — some by the constitution of their mind, which makes it difficult for them to take hold of the supernatural; some by the re-action of their intellect, from a harsh system of doctrines; some by the misfortune of having seen professed Christians leading unchristian lives; and some by worldly and infidel society.

Now, if we send missionaries to China to convert the Heathen to Christianity, why should we not send missionaries into the next house to convert sceptics to Christianity? But it is not done. As a general thing, neither the Roman-Catholic nor the Protestant churches have sent missionaries to the sceptics. In Catholic countries, if a man avows himself a sceptic, he is punished by the Inquisition: in Protestant countries, he is denounced by the pulpits and the religious newspapers. If he were a Heathen, and believed *nothing*, he might be converted; but, as he is almost a Christian, he must be rebuked and persecuted.

There are several reasons for this. The first is, that scepticism is not regarded as an error to be corrected, but as a crime to be punished. Sceptics are believed to be wilfully so. We do not look at them as being on their way from unbelief to Christianity, — coming upward out of darkness into light; but as going downward from light to darkness, — wilfully departing from Christianity into unbelief.

In like manner, only a short time since, insanity was regarded, not as a disease to be cured, but as a disgrace to be concealed; sometimes even as a crime to be punished. The unfortunate maniac was treated as if he had ceased to be a human being, — chained, beaten, exposed to cold, hunger, and dirt. Under this treatment, they naturally grew worse, and often became incurable. Now we have learned that it is no more disgraceful to have a diseased brain than diseased lungs; and that careful nursing and scientific treatment are as useful in the one case as in the other.

In like manner, we must come to regard scepticism as a disease to be cured, and not a crime to be punished. The sceptic is one, who, by some misfortune, is not able to understand all mysteries and all knowledge. The spiritual organ is inactive. There is a mist, hiding from his eyes the supernatural world. He is the slave of facts and laws, and cannot take hold of causes. He does not need to be denounced, but to be cured.

But the difficulty with Orthodoxy is, that it has no method of cure suited to the case of sceptics. Proceeding from the principle of total depravity, it believes every unconverted man incapable of seeing the truth. Until he is converted, nothing can be done. Scepticism proceeds from the carnal mind, and every natural man is at heart a sceptic. Orthodoxy, therefore, is logically obliged,

by its radical principle, to treat the sceptic, not with truth or argument, but with rhetoric and rebuke. If a man doubts the Trinity, it says, "Repent;" if he questions miracles, it says, "Be converted;" if he denies the authenticity of the Second Epistle of Peter, it tells him to "flee from the wrath to come;" if he hesitates at believing that the world was created in six days, it asks, "Why will you die?"

Such treatment as this very naturally only confirms scepticism instead of curing it. They will not be convinced, if, when they ask for the bread of truth, they have a stone thrown at them by way of reply. They know they are not to blame for their scepticism; there is nothing wilful about it; and therefore this kind of appeal does not reach their conscience.

Another reason why Orthodoxy is incapable of treating scepticism with success is, that it is afraid of it. It must defend its whole system; for, if any link is broken, the whole falls. Its force is not equal to man all its fortifications; and yet, if any part is left undefended, the whole city may be taken. It has to defend the whole of the Old Testament as well as the New. Asserting the plenary inspiration of every part, it makes Christianity responsible for Balaam's ass and Jonah's whale, for the Deluge of Noah and the Song of Solomon. It must defend itself against geologists, who assail Genesis; against critics, who attack the authenticity of the Book of Daniel; against theologians, who question the doctrine of the Atonement; against common sense, which rejects the Trinity; against common humanity, that cannot believe Everlasting Punishment; against common morality, that condemns the doctrine of Election. Orthodoxy thus has enough to do in defending itself; and, if sceptics will let it alone, it will let them alone.

But we Unitarians, who do not consider doubt or unbelief as necessarily a crime; we, who think that the Bible may be inspired, without being infallible; that the Old Testament was for the Jews principally, and that the New Testament contains our revelation; we, who distinguish between religion and theology, between belief and Christian life, and make character, not opinion, the test of Christianity; who are glad when a man believes a little, and esteem that little the first step to something more; who regard all God's revelations as in harmony with each other, and in accordance with reason; who do not believe there is any thing in Christianity opposed to nature, to conscience, to reason, or to the highest convictions of the soul, — we ought not to be afraid of scepticism; for we are capable of meeting and overcoming it.

For such reasons as these, it may be asserted that Unitarian churches should be missionary churches. All should do something for missions. A collection for missions should be as regular a part of the church-work as a collection for the poor.

---

## LETTER FROM MAINE.

Perry, Me., Oct. 11, 1860.

Mr. Clarke, — You will, I know, be glad to hear of any indication, however slight, of the Broad-Church extension, — the increase of the number of persons who are willing to hear those whose opinions they deem defective or erroneous. Let me tell you, then, of four Sundays spent during this summer and autumn in the neighboring town of Charlotte. Charlotte is a farming town of between six and seven hundred inhabitants, lying north-west from the

place of my date and settlement. It is of large extent, and is divided into several parts quite distinct from one another; and, in each of these sections, occasional preaching is had; in two or three of them, churches are formed: but, if I am rightly informed, the town has never, in its existence of about forty years, had spent upon it the undivided labors of a settled minister. The part which is most central — that lying in the neighborhood of Round Pond — is the one I have visited. I have spent there each fourth Sunday since the middle of July; and each Sunday a collection has been taken up, which goes to the aid of the society here in my support.

I have usually driven up Sunday morning. The distance is twelve miles. The road for two miles and a half passes along the shore of our beautiful bay, the St. Andrew's (the northern arm of the Passamaquoddy, and the mouth of the St. Croix River). On the opposite shore, which is from six to thirteen miles distant, lie the hills of New Brunswick; some of which, blue in the distance, are almost mountains. On the shore, with its lighthouse, is the decaying city of St. Andrew's. Turning wext, two miles bring us to Boyden's Lake. Though the distance is so short, we find here all the change to inland scenery. Instead of the rough sea-wall, there are gentle undulations on every hand. The land slopes gradually down to the water's edge. The vegetation has change too. Here and there an oak stands protected from the winds, which never would have spared it on the shore. Good farms skirt the lake. In a calm morning, the scene is full of peace and serenity; but, as the autumn has advanced, the wind has made the lake a little sea, with its miniature waves and white caps. Leaving this, the road is less inviting for a mile or two: but, emerging from the swampy growth of alders and gaining higher land, we have, on our right,

rough, rocky hills; but, on our left, the long and narrow Pennimaquon Lake. This feeds Pembroke River, which drives the iron-works in that town, and is thus the source of much enterprise and thrift; but it is none the less a thing of beauty. Unlike the last lake, the shores are wild, rough with rocks, or clothed with those beautifiers of uncouth places, — the spruce and fir. Only here and there is a settlement.

But we must hasten over the few miles that are cheered by this mirror of water reflecting the morning sun, and the narrow strip of land is reached which divides this lake from Round Pond. I remember Round Pond with the most pleasure as I saw it in my last visit. The growth which skirts its waters is, for the most part, young and small, but principally hard-wood: so the setting to this crystal was tinted with the bright colors of which autumn is so lavish. Each little birch and maple was gay, and the bright circlet of blended colors vied with the glistening waters.

In the schoolhouse, which is neat, and well adapted to our present purpose, the Sunday school is gathered. For many years it has been the custom here, during the summer and autumn months, to meet on Sunday morning, old and young together, and hold a Sunday school. There has been in this a union of those belonging to denominations which usually stand widely apart. The majority are Baptists, and they have a small, organized church; but a few are Universalists; and all unite as teachers and scholars. It is true, the quiet is once in a while broken by a discussion; but the friendly feeling remains undisturbed. But will the Baptists remain, and listen to one whose sentiments they must deem so defective, and who comes under the auspices of the Universalists? Yes: the thought seems to have been, "We are few enough at best; and, when we have preaching, let us all go." In short, that schoolhouse

contains a little section of the Broad Church. At any rate, the Liberal portion have generally attended the Calvinistic preaching; and now the compliment is returned.

More than this, they have mutually aided one another pecuniarily in obtaining preaching. They seem, if I may judge by the appearance of the little congregation, heartily to desire to join in public worship, and listen to a sermon.

I never have enjoyed preaching more than in these four Sundays. You know how pleasant it is to address those who really want to hear. Then, too, the kindly union gives a pleasant warmth to the atmosphere of the room. I feel benefited by meeting thus good men holding a different belief from my own. They, I hope, may receive, in turn, some measure of that great boon, — the enlargement of one's sphere of thought and Christian fellowship.

There is added the friendly, social intercourse of those whose homes are separated by bleak hills; no unimportant adjunct to the loving worship of God.

I am to preach there one more Sunday, unless the day be stormy. Yours fraternally,

T. D. H.

---

## GROW UP IN ALL THINGS.

Our Christian growth is not to be partial, but universal; not one-sided, but all-sided. Thus far, it has been the object of all the churches to educate the soul only in some one direction. In one church, the Christian grows up into *ascetic piety;* in another church, into *ecclesiastical piety;* in another, into *emotional piety;* in another, into *philanthropic piety;* and in still another, into *dogmatic piety.* But it is the object of Christianity to develop equally the whole man, — spirit, soul, and body, — head, heart, and hands.

Very fatal to the Christian Church has been this, its one-sided development. It has caused it to make war on human nature, trying ineffectually to destroy where it ought to fulfil, — trying to put asunder what God has joined together. Forgetting that God made all parts of man, and called them all very good, it has made war, sometimes on the reason, sometimes on the conscience, sometimes on the social affections, sometimes on the imagination and taste, and almost always on the playful and mirthful tendencies of childhood and youth. Sometimes it has been made a sin to exercise one's reason in an honest search for truth; sometimes a sin to cultivate a taste for art; sometimes a sin to dance, to read a story, or attend a play; sometimes a sin to drink a glass of wine or a cup of coffee. In some ages of the church, Christian sanctity has consisted in abstaining from marriage, and in sacrificing the joy and good of the family affections. In another age, to fly from all society, and to live in a cave, has been accounted the acme of holiness. Although the Apostle Paul said that one might bestow all his goods to feed the poor, and give his body to be burned, without love, and that it would then profit him nothing; yet vows of poverty and the martyr's crown have been believed to offer a perfect title to heaven. And the ideal of Christian piety at the present time has been made so narrow, shallow, and insipid, as to repel the most healthy natures. The pictures of Scripture subjects painted before the time of Raphael represented Jesus and his apostles, the Virgin, the saints, and the prophets, as withered ascetics. Their limbs were lank and thin, their features starved, their eyes without lustre, and their whole expression that of an introverted devotion, of a spectral piety. The change of meaning in the word *ghost*, from spirit to spectre, contains a whole history; showing that a spiritual life was regarded as spectral.

And, even now, the ideal of Christian piety is equally narrow. Piety is supposed to consist mainly in abstinence. Though the father of the prodigal son had music and dancing, it would not do for a pious father to have dancing in his house at his son's return now. Though God, in the Bible, invites us to reason with him, pious people must not reason now. A pious man must not laugh or joke; must not fish or shoot or row; must not go to the theatre, read a novel, or act in a charade. Piety is made to consist rather in emotional feelings toward God than in active uses toward men. Hence, as the nature of woman is more emotional than that of man, it is absurdly supposed that religion is better suited to women than to men; as though half of the race were physiologically nearer to God than the other half. We exclude from the church the mirth of childhood, the cheerfulness of youth, the more active energies of manhood; confining it to those somewhat exceptional natures which happen to have a taste and capacity for emotional piety.

This is not the way to grow up in all things into Him who is the Head. In a church, every variety of character should find itself at home. It is called a family, — the whole family in heaven and earth; and, like a family, should contain every variety of character, tendency, age, faculty, united by a common interest and a common affection. This variety in unity makes the charm of a household. Brought thus close together, these varieties act and re-act on each other as a genial discipline. The young husband and wife, so different in all their tastes, habits, and qualities, but brought into intimate union by the great attraction of their love, modify and mould each other through every particle of their nature. She is strengthened, and he is softened.

"She humanizes him, and he
Educates her to liberty."

See them a year after marriage, and you find them wholly transformed, — enlarged, deepened, refined, by this subtle, mutual influence. It is by their differences that they help each other. And so the children act upon parents, and parents on children, by their differences, — brothers on sisters, and sisters on brothers. The differences attract each other; the extremes meet; the little tottering infant and the gray-haired grandfather are the best playfellows. Many years ago, I stopped at the house of an old mountaineer, a man of gigantic strength and size, who had spent his life in the hills and woods, fighting with bears and wolves. Coming home one evening, I found him sitting with two little darling daughters on his knees, all three singing Methodist hymns. There could not have been a sweeter picture. The contrast of the colossal strength of the man and the infantile faces of the children — contrasts harmonized by the power of affection, and the suggestion of the mutual influence of each on the other — made up its charm. A church should be such a family on a larger scale. Its principle of unity is a deeper love and a higher aim, and it should include larger varieties. But too often it is constructed on a principle of exclusion, rather than of inclusion. Heretics are shut out; though these are the very ones who should be taken in, that their errors may be corrected: but they are shut out, because their heresies would give the church trouble. Sinners are shut out until they have corrected their sins outside of the church; for their vices might disgrace it: yet these are those whom Jesus came to seek, and those who need the church most. The poor are shut out; for they cannot afford to buy pews: yet Jesus gave it a sign of his presence, that the poor had the gospel preached to them. Merry

people, who cannot wear a long face, are virtually excluded by the supposed condition of solemnity. Active intellects, fond of inquiry, are not welcomed. And so, as one variety of human life after another is excluded, the church becomes narrowed down to a mere clique; and the church, *not* "compacted of that which every joint" should supply, does *not* "make increase of the body," nor "build itself up in love."

Let us hope that the time will come in which it will be seen that all of life needs Christianity, and that the church needs all of human life; that we are to "grow up *in all things* into our Head;" that Christianity is not a partial, but universal development; that the church is not the school of a narrow piety alone, "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," but is also a school for charity, where people shall learn how to do good, — learn how to think and how to speak. Then the Christian will not be like an elm-tree or a tulip-tree, growing in a forest, — a mere trunk, straining up to the light; but like the same trees standing alone in a sunny meadow, spreading out their magnificent arms, wreathed with drooping festoons of foliage, or covered with thousands of yellow flowers.

## THE CINCINNATI CHURCHES.

Since writing the article in the August number of the "Monthly," in which, among other things, the unfortunate church-difficulty in Cincinnati was spoken of, we have received two letters from esteemed friends, members of Mr. Conway's congregation, who both think that a wrong inference will be drawn from our remarks concerning that dis-

pute. One of these gentlemen, whose course in the whole affair has been most Christian and honorable, says, —

"To much of your article I assent; but you leave it to be inferred, rather than state expressly, that Mr. Conway's friends proposed a compromise, but afterwards backed out, and are now trying to break it up.

"This is an injurious error, — injurious, as it misrepresents the position of good men. You have been misinformed.

"I proposed the compromise without conference with any one. I never hesitated in my support of it; have done all I could to carry it out, and shall persist to the end in doing so. Others of Mr. Conway's friends co-operated with me in supporting it, and have never backed out in any way. That a few who once favored it may now dissent, is true; but the number of such is easily told. . . .

"We who have supported this compromise did and do so for the sake of peace. There are those in the Church of the Redeemer, whom we respect and love; and we thought that, when so serious a division exists in a church, the Christian way of settling any question of property is, not to stand upon the order of counting numbers, but to divide equally.

"The larger number of those of Mr. Conway's friends who oppose this compromise never acceded to it. The gentlemen who brought the suit voted from the beginning against any division at all.

"The gentlemen among Mr. Conway's friends who assented to *a* division of the property never assented to *the* division. They have always voted against the various plans which have been suggested, though supporting the general proposition, that it was best to sell, and divide in the way they proposed; viz., by paying to the seceding members the cost of their pews. Their view was and is, that the minority ought not to ask the majority to divide the property; but, if they were paid what they put into the church, it would be all they could claim. Those of us who felt that investments in churches could not properly be computed in money dissented from this view, but felt that our friends had a right to hold it, and we no right to quarrel with them on that account."

The above statement is so distinct and precise, that we have thought it most just to print it in the writer's own words. Our object, in the few words we said on the subject, was to do justice to both parties; and, if our language conveyed a false impression, we desire it to be corrected.

The statement we made in the August number was this:—

"It was only just and right that the property should be divided. ( ʌ ) Mr. Conway's friends proposed this; the other party accepted it. Afterward, one of Mr. Conway's party obtained an injunction to prevent the sale. The question, then, was tried; and the court decided that it was just to sell the property. ( ʌ ) Mr. Conway's friends appealed to a higher court; and there the matter stands."

To make our statement correct, therefore, it is necessary to insert the words "some of" in the two places where the caret ( ʌ ) is placed. Mr Conway's party was divided in opinion from the first, and those who have refused to divide the property are those who never consented to doing it.

We still hope that this dispute about money will terminate, if it has not already been decided. Then the two churches can go on, and do each its own appropriate work, without interfering with each other. Each contains conscientious Christian men and women. As far as Mr. Conway is concerned, we have no doubt that his desire is that the "Church of the Redeemer" shall succeed in all its efforts to build itself up and be useful. He does not wish to oppose it in any way; but we believe he would gladly help it, if it were in his power to do so. Cincinnati is wide enough for both churches, and there is work enough for both to do.

## REVISION OF OUR NEW TESTAMENT.

*On the Authorised Version of the New Testament, in connection with some recent proposals for its Revision.* By Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D.

The Dean of Westminster is of opinion that there are imperfections in the present version of the New Testament, which satisfy his mind that a revision ought to come, and that it will come. Of course, he thinks very highly of the present version. But some words have changed their meaning in English since it was translated: among which he mentions "take no thought" (Matt. vi. 25); "prevent" (Luke xiii. 7); "devotions" (Acts xvii. 23); "robbers of churches" (Acts xix. 37); "took up our carriages" (Acts xxi. 15); "end-saving" (Eph. iv. 8); "nephews" for descendants (1 Tim. v. 4); "Easter" for Passover (Acts xii. 4). He notices defects of grammar; as, "Though he were a son," for was (Heb. v. 8); and others in John ix. 31; Matt. xvi. 15; Heb. ix. 5; Rev. xxi. 12. He thinks our translation defective in some of its rendering of proper names and technical terms, and especially in translating the same word differently at different times; for introducing some unnecessary distinctions, and translating the same word by different English terms, without sufficient reason; for effacing some real distinctions; for forsaking better renderings existing in previous translations; for mistakes in the Greek; for doubtful and erroneous translations. He gives a multitude of texts which he thinks should be altered in a new revision. He sees the difficulty of making and introducing such a revision and is not entirely cautious in his suggestions concerning it. "There are times," says he, "when the whole matter pre-

sents itself as so full of difficulty and doubtful hazard, that one could be well content to resign all gains that would accrue from this revision, and only ask that all things might remain as they were. But this, I am persuaded, is impossible. However we may be disposed to let the question alone, it will not let us alone. The time will come, when the inconveniences of remaining where we are will be so manifestly greater than the inconveniences of action, that this last will become inevitable."

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Since our last Notice.*

*Harrington:* a Story of True Love. By the author of "What Cheer?" &c. 1 vol. Pp. 558. Price $1.25. Published by Thayer & Eldridge, 114 and 116, Washington Street, Boston.

*Lake House.* By FANNY LEWALD. Translated from the German, by Nathaniel Greene. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861. Pp. 300.

*Guesses at Truth.* By Two Brothers. From the Fifth London Edition. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*The Heroes of Europe:* a Biographical Outline of European History. By HENRY G. HEWLETT. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*Tom Brown at Oxford:* a Sequel to School-days at Rugby. Part First. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*Pictures and Flowers for Child-Lovers.* Boston: Walker, Wise, & Company, 245, Washington Street. 1861.

*Legends of the Madonna*, as represented in the Fine Arts. By Mrs. JAMESON. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*The Recreations of a Country Parson.* Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*Das Christenthum, und die Christliche Kirche.* Der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. Von FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR. Zweite, neue durchgearbeitete Ausgabe. Tübingen: 1860.

*Faithful Forever.* By COVENRRY PATMORE, author of "The Angel in the House." Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*Home Ballads and Poems.* By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

It will be seen that Ticknor & Fields have issued from their prolific press a fine collection of works, — some original, and some reprints. The new collection of *Poems* by Whittier, and the translation, by Nathaniel Greene, of *Lake House*, are of the first kind. The rest of their publications are reprints of valuable English works. All of these, except two, we can commend heartily: only one of them we find ourselves unable to commend at all.

*Guesses at Truth* is a very valuable book. In England it has passed through five editions: this is reprinted from the fifth. Archdeacon Hare (Julius Charles Hare) and his brother (Augustus William Hare) are its authors, as is well known to most readers. Archdeacon Hare (whose beautiful face is beautifully engraved in this volume) was a man of pure aims and noble gifts. He was one of the founders of the Broad Church. Perhaps he leans a little toward the sentimental side of religion. Perhaps he is deficient somewhat in breadth and strength. But this is a volume to keep and read and read again. Its sweetness of spirit is charming, and it contains many suggestive words. This volume contains both series, which in England were published separately.

The book which we can only commend moderately is *Tom Brown at Oxford.* It undoubtedly contains some wholesome reading; but the tone of it, as a whole, is rather to encourage the extravagant tendency to amusements, — boating, card-playing, wine-drinking, fighting, and the like. However, we can commend the book, on the whole; though we do not like it as well as the other Tom Brown and his *School-days at Rugby.*

But the book which we cannot praise or recommend at all is Coventry Patmore's *Faithful Forever.* Tieck says that "most poetry now-a-days is prose run mad, and most prose is gouty verse." This is neither the one nor the other. It is the flattest of prose, made more flat by being written as if it were verse. It may, for all we know, be pre-Raffaellite poetry; and so Mr. Ruskin likes it, and utters his dogmatic opinion that all other human beings shall also like it. "The

Caleb has drunk let the world go to dinner." But, whatever Mr. Bonham may say, we assert that no other human being ever said all of such stuff as this, which we copy literally from the book, morality nothing; it is worse instead of as verse.

Jane to Mrs. Graham (page 119):—

"Dear Mother-in-Law, — Dear Fred you've heard I've married him; weeks have and would; he begs you'll come and see us soon. Dear Fred will be on leave of June; and for a week or even more, we shall be very glad, I'm sure. Dear Fred said I must write; for though it seemed so disrespectful not. I'm sure that's the last thing I'll be to dear Fred's relations. Both he and I are very well, dear Mrs. Graham, and remain sincerely yours the same. The house is rather small we've got, but dear Fred says yours is not so large by half: so you'll not mind.

"If you can't leave your maid behind (who, Fred says, always goes with you, I'll manage somehow for her too.

"You've heard of Uncle John, no doubt. My choice, more than he found it out, displeased him till he saw dear Fred; who you'll be glad to think's a well-bred and extremely nice young man. When I told Uncle John our plan about you, he said of his own accord, 'Well, Jane, my dear, you must afford to have a webicle: so while you're mother-in-law is here, I'll send my carriage every day. The turnpikes will not be much to pay.' &c.

This may be poetry. If so, it is the only poetry that has ever been written. Milton, Tennyson, Coleridge, and Byron would protest, if this is verse.

It is only necessary to add, that the substance of this book is as sterile as the form is dire. It is utterly devoid of meaning, plan, aim or thought. Any one whom you shall meet, be he or woman, could improvise a book like this by just writing down any thing he happened to think of, and then arranging the lines, with capitals at the beginning, and bad rhymes at the end.

Hollingsworth is a young writer by a person of talent, and with a good aim and spirit. It is a philanthropic romance. But it is recklessly written in a hurry. There is scarcely any plot: the style is throughout inflated, the sentiments grandiloquent and the writing bad. A New-York publication compares the book to "a cat in a fit." This is perhaps unjust; but it gives an idea of the highly excited character of the composition. The scene near the first where Plantagenet leaps at and the enemy seven sailors, armed with knives, and knocks them down, one by one, so that, when his friends enter, they find the seven sailors lying about in a disabled condition, is one of the most comical

scenes in modern romance. *Harrington*, we understand, has been compared to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. It resembles that divinest work of the century as Kotzebue's plays resemble Shakspeare's, as Tupper's poetry resembles Tennyson's, or as the statue of Daniel Webster before the Boston State House resembles the "Venus" of Milo.

*The Recreations of a Country Parson* are well-written essays, containing admirable moral suggestions. It is, as far as we have read it, a beautifully Christian work. The illustrations are innumerable; and (we will whisper it to our clerical readers) the book is a storehouse of illustrations for sermons, to point their morals, and to enliven the tedium of abstract discussion.

*Legends of the Madonna* is one of the admirable series, by Mrs. Jameson, of Catholic studies. We are all indebted to the publishers for giving us this work in a cheap form. *Lake House* is a good translation of a pretty good story. *The Heroes of Europe*, — another good book for boys, or for school-libraries. Whittier's *Home Ballads* contain some of his best poetry, only printed in newspapers hitherto.

*An Exposé.* In Two Parts. Part First, containing a concise general view of the Holy Bible. Part Second, containing a brief description of the rise, progress, general tendency, and eventual fall, of the great Mammoth Cistern. By Amos Higby, Jun. One thousand copies of this book published by order of the Widow Eliza M. Higby, according to the provision made in the last will and testament of Amos Higby, deceased. Martinsburg, N.Y. 1859.

---

## ☞ DO NOT SKIP THIS.

In the number of the "Quarterly Journal" for October, 1859, we spoke of the "change in the Journal" from a Quarterly to a Monthly, and gave these reasons for it: —

"The reasons for this change are these. We wish to make this 'Journal' an instrument for awakening and nourishing a missionary spirit in the denomination. We mean that it shall

be devoted almost entirely to matters of denominational interest, to the exclusion of every thing of a general character. The deeper and larger discussions we leave to the 'Examiner;' matters for private edification and personal religion we leave to the 'Monthly Magazine.' We confine ourselves to those things which concern our churches in their doctrines, work, and life. We shall try to make it a Unitarian-Church journal.

"Such a journal as this is intended to be, ought to be published as often as once a month, in order to keep up with the course of events. Many things which ought to be noticed in the way of comment and criticism should be noticed immediately, while the matter is fresh in the public mind. The position of the Unitarian body is such, that it is often called upon to criticize the doctrines or the conduct of the Orthodox sects. That such criticisms should be of use, they should be prompt. We think that a periodical of the size proposed can be well filled, once a month, with matters of immediate interest; and experience has shown that a monthly periodical of the form, size, and price proposed, is one adapted to succeed in our own and in other denominations; of which the 'Unitarian Miscellany,' formerly published in Baltimore by Mr. Sparks, and the 'Millennial Harbinger,' published in Bethany, Va., by Alexander Campbell, are striking examples.

"It would be better, in all cases, for every church to take an annual subscription for missionary objects, to be expended by the Executive Committee of the Unitarian Association, and another annual subscription for the 'Monthly Journal.' Our churches ought to be able to subscribe, on an average, $50, twice a year, to these objects. Two hundred societies, at this rate, would give $10,000 a year for missionary objects through the Association, and ten thousand subscribers to the 'Monthly Church Journal' of the Unitarian body. This we expect to see done, and it is not expecting a great deal. Some of our small societies cannot do as much; but many can easily do a great deal more.

"N. B. — It will be convenient, if, as early as next December, we should hear from each of our societies how many copies of our 'Monthly' they wish to receive."

Also in the February (1860) number of the "Monthly," we stated, —

"Our aim, therefore, is to do an humble but important work, — a work which shall bring no renown with it, but which shall help and instruct many. We wish to make a readable 'Monthly' for the body of people in the Unitarian churches: not a book which it is proper to read, which ought to be read, which it is improper not to read; but one which *can* be read. This may be a centre of unity and activity to us all.

"We repeat, that we do not expect to get the machine in good working order for some six months. By that time, we hope to have such a stock of articles constantly on hand, and flowing in from all sides, that we, the Editor, may lie on our oars, and float on a superb current of regular contributions. [In this we were mistaken.]

"We ask, in return for what we furnish our subscribers, that, in each parish, some one will take the trouble to act as agent, to collect subscriptions, forward names, and receive payments. It is obvious, that, for the low price at which we mean to keep the periodical, we cannot afford to do all this work ourselves. It is already done for us in many parishes: shall it not be done in all?"

We now wish to repeat to our readers our earnest wish that there should be a subscription *during this month of December*, in every parish of our body, for our "Monthly."

1. Let there be a committee of five or six ladies in each society to attend to it. They will find time to do the work when their husbands and brothers are two busy.

2. Let this committee be appointed by the pastor, or by the society at any of its meetings.

3. Let them canvass the whole society, and get the names of some one in every family, if possible, connected with it.

4. Let them send us the complete list of subscribers (and the money in advance) for 1861.

5. Let them do this before the end of December: then they can eat their Christmas-dinner in peace of mind, feeling they have done their duty in this regard.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

| 1860. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oct. 24. | From | Society in Augusta, Me., for Monthly Journals | . | $43.00 |
| „ „ | „ | friends in Pottstown, Penn., for Kansas Mission | . | 15.00 |
| „ 25. | „ | Society in Canton, as a donation | . . . . . | 25.00 |
| „ 26. | „ | Rev. Nathaniel Hall's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals, additional | . . . . . | 2.00 |
| „ 30. | „ | scattered subscribers to Monthly, in October | . . | 31.09 |
| „ „ | „ | sale of Tracts | . . . . . | 10.05 |
| Nov. 1. | „ | Rev. S. G. Bulfinch's Society, Dorchester, as a donation | . . . . . | 55.00 |
| „ 5. | „ | Ladies in Brighton Society, to make their Pastor, Rev. Charles Noyes, a Life-Member | . . . . | 30.00 |
| „ 6. | „ | Rev. Dr. Bellows' Society, New York, for Monthly Journals, additional | . . . . . | 8.00 |
| „ 8. | „ | From Rev. Francis Tiffany's Society, Springfield, as a donation | . . . . . | 582.52 |
| „ 10. | „ | Rev. E. E. Hale's Society, Boston, for Monthly Journals | . . . . . | 21.00 |
| „ 17. | „ | Contribution at New-Bedford Convention, for Rev. J. S. Brown, additional | . . . . . | 30.00 |

---

## CANDIDATES FOR SETTLEMENT.

| Preachers. | Address. |
|---|---|
| Benjamin H. Bailey | Northborough. |
| Ira Bailey | Bolton. |
| Stephen Barker | Concord, Mass. |
| Geo. Bradburn * | Athol. |
| C. A. Cutter | Cambridge. |
| F. L. Capen . . . Care of Barnard Capen, Esq., | Boston. |
| William Cushing | Clinton. |
| J. H. Fowler | Cambridge. |
| William Ware Hall | Providence, R.I. |
| Benjamin Huntoon | Marblehead. |
| Francis Le Baron | Worcester. |
| Lyman Maynard | Milford, Mass. |
| Henry L. Myrick | West Cambridge. |
| George Osgood | Montague. |
| D. C. M. Potter | Mattapoisett. |
| J. Mills Peirce | Cambridge. |
| James Richardson | Boston.* |
| Charles Robinson | Groton. |
| Ed. G. Russell | Cambridge. |
| A. S. Ryder | Hubbardston. |
| John Savary | Cambridge. |
| William H. Savary | Cambridge. |
| Livingston Stone | Cambridgeport. |
| E. Vitalis Scherb | Boston.* |
| George W. Stacy | Milford. |
| Daniel S. Whitney | Southborough. |
| George A. Williams | Deerfield. |
| Samuel D. Worden | Lowell. |
| William C. Wyman | Brooklyn, N.Y. |